arXiv:1405.1908v1 [math.OA] 8 May 2014

On maximal ideals in certain reduced twisted C*-crossed products

Erik Bédos, Roberto Conti

May 9, 2014

Abstract

We consider a twisted action of a discrete group G on a unital C*-algebra A and give conditions ensuring that there is a bijective correspondence between the maximal invariant ideals of A and the maximal ideals in the associated reduced C*-crossed product.

MSC 2010: 22D10, 22D25, 46L55, 43A07, 43A65

Keywords: twisted C*-dynamical system, twisted C*-crossed product, maximal ideals

1 Introduction

Let G denote a discrete group. We recall that G is called C*-simple [1, 16] whenever the reduced group C*-algebra $C_r^*(G)$ is simple. The class of C*-simple groups is vast and many subclasses are known. We refer to [16] for a nice overview on this topic. Some related articles that have appeared recently are [29, 26, 18, 21, 33, 24].

One open problem concerning C*-simple groups is the following (cf. [17]). Assume that a C*-simple group G acts on a unital C*-algebra A in a minimal way (that is, the only invariant ideals[1] of A are $\{0\}$ and A). Is the associated reduced C*-crossed product simple ? This question was answered positively by P. de la Harpe and G. Skandalis [17] when G is a Powers group (e.g. when G is a free nonabelian group, as in Powers' original work [28]). Their result was later extended to cover weak Powers groups and twisted actions

[1] By an ideal in a C*-algebra, we always mean a closed two-sided ideal, unless otherwise specified.

(see [6, 1]). Moreover, this question was also answered positively by M. Bekka, M. Cowling and P. de la Harpe [5] in the case where G has the so-called property (P_{com}), e.g. $G = PSL(n, \mathbb{Z})$ for $n \geq 2$. (We will see in this paper that their argument may be adapted to handle also the case of twisted actions.)

As remarked by de la Harpe and Skandalis in [17], if A is not assumed to be unital, then there are examples where the above question has a negative answer. They also give an example of an action of a Powers group on a unital C*-algebra A such that A has exactly one nontrivial invariant ideal while the associated reduced C*-crossed product has infinitely many ideals. This could be taken as an indication that it is not possible to say something of interest about the lattice of ideals in a reduced C*-crossed product involving a non minimal action of a Powers group. Our main purpose in this paper is to show that for a large class $\mathcal{P}$ of C*-simple groups, containing all weak Powers groups, one may in fact describe the maximal ideals of the reduced crossed product in the case of an exact twisted action on a unital C*-algebra by a group in $\mathcal{P}$ (see Corollary 3.9). The class $\mathcal{P}$ consists of all PH groups (as defined by S.D. Promislow [30]) and all groups with property (P_{com}). In the case of a weak Powers group, this result was briefly discussed in [4, Example 6.6].

As a part of our work, we introduce a certain property for a twisted unital discrete C*-dynamical system $\Sigma = (A, G, \alpha, \sigma)$ that we call (DP) (named after Dixmier and Powers). This property, which is weaker than the Dixmier property for the reduced crossed product $C_r^*(\Sigma)$, is always satisfied by Σ whenever G belongs to the class $\mathcal{P}$ (see Theorem 3.8 and Section 5). Moreover, we prove that if Σ is exact [32, 4] and has property (DP), then there is a one-to-one correspondence between the set of maximal ideals of $C_r^*(\Sigma)$ and the set of maximal invariant ideals of A, and also a one-to-one correspondence between the set of all tracial states of $C_r^*(\Sigma)$ and the set of invariant tracial states of A (see Theorem 3.7 and Proposition 3.4).

To illustrate the usefulness of our results, we describe in Section 4 the maximal ideal space of some C*-algebras that may be written as $C_r^*(\Sigma)$ for a suitable Σ. These examples include $C_r^*(\Gamma)$ for any discrete group Γ such that the quotient of Γ by its center is exact and belongs to $\mathcal{P}$, $C_r^*\big(\mathbb{Z}^3 \rtimes SL(3, \mathbb{Z})\big)$, and the "twisted" Roe algebras $C_r^*(\ell^\infty(G), G, \mathrm{lt}, \sigma)$ when G is exact, belongs to $\mathcal{P}$ and the 2-cocycle σ is scalar-valued.

We use standard notation. For instance, if A is a unital C*-algebra, then $\mathcal{U}(A)$ denotes the unitary group of A and $\mathrm{Aut}(A)$ the group of all *-automorphisms of A. If $\mathcal{H}$ is a Hilbert space, then $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ denotes the bounded linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$.

2 Preliminaries

Throughout this paper, we let $\Sigma = (A, G, \alpha, \sigma)$ denote a twisted, unital, discrete C^*-dynamical system (see for instance [35, 25, 34, 8]). Thus, A is a C^*-algebra with unit 1, G is a discrete group with identity e and (α, σ) is a twisted action of G on A, that is, α is a map from G into $\mathrm{Aut}(A)$ and σ is a map from $G \times G$ into $\mathcal{U}(A)$, satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_g \circ \alpha_h &= \mathrm{Ad}(\sigma(g,h)) \circ \alpha_{gh} \\ \sigma(g,h)\sigma(gh,k) &= \alpha_g(\sigma(h,k))\sigma(g,hk) \\ \sigma(g,e) &= \sigma(e,g) = 1 \end{aligned}$$

for all $g, h, k \in G$. Of course, $\mathrm{Ad}(v)$ denotes here the (inner) automorphism of A implemented by some $v \in \mathcal{U}(A)$. One deduces easily that

$$\alpha_e = \mathrm{id},\ \sigma(g, g^{-1}) = \alpha_g(\sigma(g^{-1}, g))$$

and

$$\alpha_g^{-1} = \alpha_{g^{-1}} \circ \mathrm{Ad}(\sigma(g, g^{-1})^*) = \mathrm{Ad}(\sigma(g^{-1}, g)^*) \circ \alpha_{g^{-1}}\,.$$

Note that if σ is trivial, that is, $\sigma(g,h) = 1$ for all $g, h \in G$, then Σ is an ordinary C^*-dynamical system.

The reduced crossed product $C_r^*(\Sigma)$ associated with Σ may (up to isomorphism) be characterized as follows [35, 3]:

- $C_r^*(\Sigma)$ is generated (as a C*-algebra) by (a copy of) A and a family $\{\lambda(g) \,|\, g \in G\}$ of unitaries satisfying

  $$\alpha_g(a) = \lambda(g)\, a\, \lambda(g)^* \text{ and } \lambda(g)\,\lambda(h) = \sigma(g,h)\,\lambda(gh)$$

  for all $g, h \in G$ and $a \in A$,

- there exists a faithful conditional expectation $E : C_r^*(\Sigma) \to A$ such that $E(\lambda(g)) = 0$ for all $g \in G\,,\ g \neq e\,.$

One easily cheks that the expectation E is equivariant, that is, we have

$$E\big(\lambda(g)\, x\, \lambda(g)^*\big) = \alpha_g\big(E(x)\big)$$

for all $g \in G$, $x \in C_r^*(\Sigma)$. As is well known, it follows that if φ is a tracial state on A which is invariant (i.e. $\varphi(\alpha_g(a)) = \varphi(a)$ for all $g \in G$, $a \in A$), then $\varphi \circ E$ is a tracial state on $C_r^*(\Sigma)$ extending φ.

Let J denote an invariant ideal of A and set $\Sigma/J = (A/J, G, \dot{\alpha}, \dot{\sigma})$, where $(\dot{\alpha}, \dot{\sigma})$ denotes the twisted action of G on A/J naturally associated with (α, σ).

We will let $\langle J\rangle$ denote the ideal of $C_r^*(\Sigma)$ generated by J. Any ideal of this form is called an *induced ideal* of $C_r^*(\Sigma)$. Moreover, we will let $\tilde{J}$ denote the kernel of the canonical *-homomorphism from $C_r^*(\Sigma)$ onto $C_r^*(\Sigma/J)$. It is elementary to check that we have $E\big(\langle J\rangle\big) = J$ and $\langle J\rangle \subset \tilde{J}$. Another useful fact is that

$$\tilde{J} = \big\{x \in C_r^*(\Sigma) \mid \widehat{x}(g) \in J \text{ for all } g \in G\big\}$$

where $\widehat{x}\,(g) = E\big(x\,\lambda(g)^*\big)$ for each $x \in C_r^*(\Sigma)$, $g \in G$. This may for instance be deduced from the proof of [12, Theorem 5.1] by considering $C_r^*(\Sigma)$ as topologically graded C*-algebra over G:

$$C_r^*(\Sigma) = \overline{\bigoplus_{g\in G} A_g}^{\,\|\cdot\|},$$

where $A_g = \big\{a\,\lambda(g) \,|\, a \in A\big\}$ for each $g \in G$.

Following [32, 4], we will say that the system Σ is *exact* whenever we have $\langle J\rangle = \tilde{J}$ for every invariant ideal J of A. It is known [11] that Σ is exact whenever G is exact. It is also known [4] that Σ is exact whenever there exists a Fourier summing net for Σ preserving the invariant ideals of A. This latter condition is for instance satisfied when Σ has Exel's approximation property [10], e.g. when the associated action of G on the center $Z(A)$ of A, obtained by restricting α to $Z(A)$, is amenable (as being defined in [7]).

We include here two lemmas illustrating the impact of the exactness of Σ on the lattice of ideals of $C_r^*(\Sigma)$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{J}$ be an ideal of $C_r^*(\Sigma)$ and set $J = \overline{E(\mathcal{J})}$. Then J is an invariant ideal of A such that $\mathcal{J} \subset \tilde{J}$. Hence, if Σ is exact, we have $\mathcal{J} \subset \langle J\rangle$.*

Proof. As E is a conditional expectation, it follows readily that J is an ideal of A. The invariance of J is an immediate consequence of the equivariance of E. Let now $x \in \mathcal{J}$. Then, for each $g \in G$, we have $x\,\lambda(g)^* \in \mathcal{J}$, so

$$\widehat{x}(g) = E\big(x\,\lambda(g)^*\big) \in E(\mathcal{J}) \subset J\,.$$

Hence, $x \in \tilde{J}$. This shows that $\mathcal{J} \subset \tilde{J}$. The last assertion follows then from the definition of exactness.

□

An ideal $\mathcal{J}$ of $C_r^*(\Sigma)$ is called *E-invariant* if $E(\mathcal{J}) \subset \mathcal{J}$. Equivalently, $\mathcal{J}$ is E-invariant whenever $E(\mathcal{J}) = \mathcal{J} \cap A$ (so $E(\mathcal{J})$ is necessarily closed in this case). Any induced ideal of $C_r^*(\Sigma)$ is easily seen to be E-invariant. The converse is true if Σ is exact, as shown below. (When G is exact, this is shown in [12]; see [4] for the case where there exists a Fourier summing net for Σ preserving the invariant ideals of A).

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\mathcal{J}$ be an E-invariant ideal of $C_r^*(\Sigma)$. If Σ is exact, then $\mathcal{J}$ is an induced ideal. Indeed, we have $\mathcal{J} = \langle E(\mathcal{J})\rangle$ in this case.*

Proof. Note that since $E(\mathcal{J}) = \mathcal{J} \cap A$ is closed, it is an invariant ideal of A (cf. Lemma 2.1). Assume that Σ is exact. Then Lemma 2.1 gives that $\mathcal{J} \subset \langle E(\mathcal{J})\rangle$. On the other hand, since $E(\mathcal{J}) \subset \mathcal{J}$, we have $\langle E(\mathcal{J})\rangle \subset \mathcal{J}$. Hence, $\mathcal{J} = \langle E(\mathcal{J})\rangle$, as asserted.

□

3 On maximal ideals and reduced twisted C*-crossed products

We set $\mathcal{U}_\Sigma = \mathcal{U}\big(C_r^*(\Sigma)\big)$. When S is a subset of a (complex) vector space, we let $\mathrm{co}(S)$ denote the convex hull of S.

Definition 3.1. The system Σ is said to have *property* (DP) whenever we have

$$0 \in \overline{\mathrm{co}\{v\, y\, v^* \mid v \in \mathcal{U}_\Sigma\}}^{\,\|\cdot\|} \tag{1}$$

for every $y \in C_r^*(\Sigma)$ satisfying $y^* = y$ and $E(y) = 0$.

Remark 3.2. Let $\mathcal{U}_G$ be the subgroup of $\mathcal{U}_\Sigma$ generated by the $\lambda(g)$'s. The above definition might be strengthened by replacing $\mathcal{U}_\Sigma$ with $\mathcal{U}_G$, that is, by requiring that

$$0 \in \overline{\mathrm{co}\{v\, y\, v^* \mid v \in \mathcal{U}_G\}}^{\,\|\cdot\|} \tag{2}$$

for every $y \in C_r^*(\Sigma)$ satisfying $y^* = y$ and $E(y) = 0$. All the examples of systems we are going to describe satisfy this strong form of property (DP). It can be shown (see Proposition 5.9) that if Σ has this strong property (DP), then (2) holds for every $y \in C_r^*(\Sigma)$ satisfying $E(y) = 0$. It is not clear to us that if Σ has property (DP), then (1) holds for every such y.

Remark 3.3. We recall that a unital C*-algebra B is said to have the *Dixmier property* if

$$\overline{\mathrm{co}\{u\, b\, u^* \mid u \in \mathcal{U}(B)\}}^{\,\|\cdot\|} \cap \mathbb{C} \cdot 1 \neq \emptyset$$

for every $b \in B$. As shown by L. Zsido and U. Haagerup in [15], B is simple with at most one tracial state if and only if B has the Dixmier property. Using [15, Corollaire, p. 175], it follows that if $C_r^*(\Sigma)$ has the Dixmier property, then Σ has the property (DP) introduced above. Property (DP) may be seen as a kind of relative Dixmier property for the pair $(A, C_r^*(\Sigma))$, generalizing the property considered by R. Powers [28] in the case where $\Sigma = (\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{F}_2, \mathrm{id}, 1)$. It should not be confused with the notion of relative Dixmier property for inclusions of C*-algebras considered by S. Popa in [27].

A first consequence of property (DP) is the following:

Proposition 3.4. *Assume Σ has property (DP). Then the map $\varphi \to \varphi \circ E$ is a bijection between the set of invariant tracial states of A and the set of tracial states of $C_r^*(\Sigma)$. Especially, $C_r^*(\Sigma)$ has a unique tracial state if and only if A has a unique invariant tracial state.*

Proof. It is clear that this map is injective, so let us prove that it is surjective. Let therefore τ be a tracial state on $C_r^*(\Sigma)$ and let φ denote the tracial state of A obtained by restricting τ to A. It follows from the covariance relation that φ is invariant. We will show that $\tau = \varphi \circ E$.

Let $x^* = x \in C_r^*(\Sigma)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Set $y = x - E(x)$. As $y^* = y$ and $E(y) = E\big(x - E(x)\big) = E(x) - E(x) = 0$, property (DP) enables us to pick $v_1, \ldots, v_n \in \mathcal{U}_\Sigma$ and $t_1, \ldots, t_n \in [0,1]$ satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^n t_i = 1$ such that

$$\Big\| \sum_{i=1}^n t_i \, v_i \, y \, v_i^* \Big\| < \varepsilon \,.$$

As τ is a tracial, we have

$$\tau\Big(\sum_{i=1}^n t_i \, v_i \, y \, v_i^* \Big) = \sum_{i=1}^n t_i \, \tau(y) = \tau(y) \,,$$

so we get

$$|\tau(y)| = \Big| \tau\Big(\sum_{i=1}^n t_i \, v_i \, y \, v_i^* \Big) \Big| \leq \Big\| \sum_{i=1}^n t_i \, v_i \, y \, v_i^* \Big\| < \varepsilon \,.$$

Hence, we can conclude that $\tau(y) = 0$. This gives that

$$\tau(x) = \tau(E(x)) = (\varphi \circ E)(x) \,.$$

So τ agrees with $\varphi \circ E$ on the self-adjoint part of $C_r^*(\Sigma)$, and therefore on the whole of $C_r^*(\Sigma)$ by linearity.

□

Next, we have:

Proposition 3.5. *Assume that Σ has property (DP) and let $\mathcal{J}$ be a proper ideal of $C_r^*(\Sigma)$. Set $J = \overline{E(\mathcal{J})}$. Then J is a proper invariant ideal of A.*

Proof. We know from Lemma 2.1 that J is an invariant ideal of A. Assume that J is not proper, i.e., $\overline{E(\mathcal{J})} = A$. Since A is unital, we have $E(\mathcal{J}) = A$. So we may pick $x \in \mathcal{J}$ such that $E(x) = 1$.

Set $z = x^*x \in \mathcal{J}^+$. Using the Schwarz inequality for complete positive maps [7], we get

$$E(z) = E(x^*x) \geq E(x)^*E(x) = 1\,.$$

Now, set $y = z - E(z)$, so $y^* = y \in C_r^*(\Sigma)$ and $E(y) = 0$. Since Σ has property (DP), we can find $v_1, \ldots, v_n \in \mathcal{U}_\Sigma$ and $t_1, \ldots, t_n \in [0,1]$ satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^n t_i = 1$ such that

$$(*) \quad \Big\| \sum_{i=1}^n t_i\, v_i\, z\, v_i^* \; - \sum_{i=1}^n t_i\, v_i\, E(z)\, v_i^* \Big\| = \Big\| \sum_{i=1}^n t_i\, v_i\, y\, v_i^* \Big\| \; < \; \frac{1}{2}\,.$$

Setting $z' = \sum_{i=1}^n t_i\, v_i\, z\, v_i^*$, we have $z' \in \mathcal{J}^+$. Since $E(z) \geq 1$, we also have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n t_i\, v_i\, E(z)\, v_i^* \geq 1\,.$$

Hence, it follows from $(*)$ that z' is invertible. So we must have $\mathcal{J} = C_r^*(\Sigma)$, which contradicts the properness of $\mathcal{J}$. This shows that J is proper.

□

Corollary 3.6. *Assume Σ has property (DP) and is minimal (that is, $\{0\}$ is the only proper invariant ideal of A). Then $C_r^*(\Sigma)$ is simple.*

Proof. Since E is faithful, this follows immediately from Proposition 3.5.

□

If Σ is exact and has property (DP), we can in fact characterize the maximal ideals of $C_r^*(\Sigma)$. We therefore set

$$\mathcal{MI}(A) = \big\{J \subset A \mid J \text{ is a maximal invariant ideal of } A\big\},$$

$$\mathcal{M}\big(C_r^*(\Sigma)\big) = \big\{\mathcal{J} \subset C_r^*(\Sigma) \mid \mathcal{J} \text{ is a maximal ideal of } C_r^*(\Sigma)\big\}.$$

It follows from Zorn's lemma that both these sets are nonempty.

Theorem 3.7. *Assume Σ is exact and has property (DP).*
Then the map $J \to \langle J\rangle$ is a bijection between $\mathcal{MI}(A)$ and $\mathcal{M}\big(C_r^*(\Sigma)\big)$.
Thus, the family of all simple quotients of $C_r^*(\Sigma)$ is given by

$$\Big\{C_r^*\big(\Sigma/J\big)\Big\}_{J\in\mathcal{MI}(A)}$$

Proof. Let $J \in \mathcal{MI}(A)$. We have to show that $\langle J\rangle \in \mathcal{M}\big(C_r^*(\Sigma)\big)$. We first note that $\langle J\rangle$ is a proper ideal of $C_r^*(\Sigma)$; otherwise, we would have $J = E(\langle J\rangle) = A$, contradicting that J is a proper ideal of A.

Next, let $\mathcal{K}$ be a proper ideal of $C_r^*(\Sigma)$ containing $\langle J\rangle$, and set $K = \overline{E(\mathcal{K})}$. Since Σ has property (DP), Proposition 3.5 gives that K is a proper invariant ideal of A. Moreover, we have $J = E(\langle J\rangle) \subset E(\mathcal{K}) \subset K$. By maximality of J, we get $J = K$, which gives

$$E(\mathcal{K}) = K = J \subset \langle J\rangle \subset \mathcal{K}\,.$$

Thus, $\mathcal{K}$ is E-invariant. Since Σ is exact, we get from Lemma 2.2 that $\mathcal{K} = \langle K\rangle$. As $J = K$, we conclude that $\mathcal{K} = \langle J\rangle$. Thus, we have shown that $\langle J\rangle$ is maximal among the proper ideals of $C_r^*(\Sigma)$, as desired.

This means that the map $J \to \langle J\rangle$ maps $\mathcal{MI}(A)$ into $\mathcal{M}\big(C_r^*(\Sigma)\big)$. This map is clearly injective (since $E(\langle J\rangle) = J$ for every invariant ideal J of A).

To show that it is surjective, let $\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{M}\big(C_r^*(\Sigma)\big)$ and set $J = \overline{E(\mathcal{J})}$. We will show that $J \in \mathcal{MI}(A)$ and $\mathcal{J} = \langle J\rangle$.

Since Σ has property (DP) and $\mathcal{J}$ is a proper ideal of $C_r^*(\Sigma)$, Proposition 3.5 gives that J is a proper invariant ideal of A. Further, since Σ is exact, Lemma 2.1 gives that $\mathcal{J} \subset \langle J\rangle$. As $\mathcal{J}$ is maximal, we get $\mathcal{J} = \langle J\rangle$.

Finally, J is a maximal among the proper invariant ideals of A. Indeed, let K be a proper invariant ideal of A containing J. Then we have $\mathcal{J} = \langle J\rangle \subset \langle K\rangle$. By maximality of $\mathcal{J}$, we get $\langle J\rangle = \langle K\rangle$. This implies that $J = E(\langle J\rangle) = E(\langle K\rangle) = K$. Hence, we have shown that $J \in \mathcal{MI}(A)$.

□

To give examples of systems satisfying property (DP), we let $\mathcal{P}$ denote the class of discrete groups consisting of PH groups [30] and of groups satisfying the property $(P_{\rm com})$ introduced in [5]. The class $\mathcal{P}$, which is a subclass of the class of discrete C*-simple groups, contains a huge variety of groups, including for instance many amalgamated free products, HNN-extensions, hyperbolic groups, Coxeter groups, and lattices in semisimple Lie groups. For a more precise description, we refer to [16] (see also [18]). The following result may be seen as a generalization of results in [17, 6, 1, 30, 5]. For the convenience of the reader, we will give a proof in Section 5.

Theorem 3.8. *Let $G \in \mathcal{P}$. Then Σ has property (DP).*

Thus, we get:

Corollary 3.9. *Let $G \in \mathcal{P}$. Then the map $\varphi \to \varphi \circ E$ is a bijection between the set of invariant tracial states of A and the set of tracial states of $C_r^*(\Sigma)$.*

Moreover, assume Σ is exact. Then the map $J \to \langle J \rangle$ is a bijection between $\mathcal{MI}(A)$ and $\mathcal{M}\big(C_r^*(\Sigma)\big)$. Thus, the family of all simple quotients of $C_r^*(\Sigma)$ is given by

$$\Big\{C_r^*\big(\Sigma/J\big)\Big\}_{J \in \mathcal{MI}(A)}$$

Proof. Since $G \in \mathcal{P}$, we know from Theorem 3.8 that Σ has property (DP). The result follows therefore from Proposition 3.4 and Theorem 3.7. □

Corollary 3.10. *Assume $G \in \mathcal{P}$. If A has a unique invariant tracial state, then $C_r^*(\Sigma)$ has a unique tracial state. If Σ is minimal, then $C_r^*(\Sigma)$ is simple.*

Proof. This follows from Proposition 3.4, Corollary 3.6 and Theorem 3.8. □

Corollary 3.11. *Let $G \in \mathcal{P}$ and let $\omega \in Z^2(G, \mathbb{T})$. Then $C_r^*(G, \omega)$ is simple with a unique tracial state.*

In fact, proceeding as in the proof of [1, Corollary 4.10] and [2, Corollary 4], one sees that Corollary 3.11 holds whenever G is a *ultra-$\mathcal{P}$* group, meaning that G has a normal subgroup belonging to $\mathcal{P}$ with trivial centralizer in G. Moreover, in the same way, one easily deduces that [1, Corollaries 4.8, 4.9, 4.10, 4.11, 4.12] and [2, Corollaries 5 and 6] still hold if one replaces *weak Powers group* by *group in the class $\mathcal{P}$*, and *ultraweak Powers group* by *ultra-$\mathcal{P}$ group* in the statement of these results.

It may also be worth mentioning explicitely the following result:

Corollary 3.12. *Let $G \in \mathcal{P}$ and assume A is abelian, so $A = C(X)$ for some compact Hausdorff space X. Then there is a one-to-one correspondence between the set of Borel probability measures on X and the set of tracial states of $C_r^*(\Sigma)$ given by $\mu \to \int_X E(\cdot)\, d\mu$.*

Moreover, assume Σ is exact. Then there is a one-to-one correspondence between the set $\mathcal{Y}$ of minimal closed invariant subsets of X and $\mathcal{M}\big(C_r^*(\Sigma)\big)$ given by $Y \to \Big\langle C_0\big(X \setminus Y\big)\Big\rangle$. Moreover, the family of all simple quotients of $C_r^*(\Sigma)$ is given by

$$\Big\{C_r^*\big(C(Y), G, \alpha_Y, \sigma_Y\big)\Big\}_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}}$$

where (α_Y, σ_Y) denotes the twisted quotient action of G on $C(Y)$ associated with (α, σ).

Proof. This follows immediately from Theorem 3.9 and Gelfand theory. □

When α is trivial, σ is just some 2-cocycle on G with values in $\mathcal{U}(Z(A))$, so $C_r^*(\Sigma)$ is a kind of "twisted" tensor product of A with $C_r^*(G)$. In this case, we don't have to restrict our attention to maximal ideals of $C_r^*(\Sigma)$:

Proposition 3.13. *Assume α is trivial, Σ is exact and $G \in \mathcal{P}$. Then the map $J \to \langle J \rangle$ is a bijection between the set of ideals of A and the set of ideals of $C_r^*(\Sigma)$.*

Proof. Since α is trivial and Σ is exact, it follows immediately from Lemma 2.2 that the map $J \to \langle J \rangle$ is a bijection between the set of ideals of A and the set of E-invariant ideals of $B = C_r^*(\Sigma)$. Hence, it suffices to show that any ideal of B is E-invariant.

Let $\mathcal{J}$ be an ideal of B, $y^* = y \in \mathcal{J}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Set $x = y - E(y)$. Then $x^* = x \in B$ and $E(x) = 0$. Since $G \in \mathcal{P}$, it follows from the proof of Theorem 3.8 given is Section 5 that there exists a G-averaging process ψ on B (as defined in Section 5) such that $\|\psi(x)\| < \varepsilon$. Now, since α is trivial, any G-averaging process on B restricts to the identity map on A. Thus, we get $\psi(x) = \psi(y) - \psi(E(y)) = \psi(y) - E(y)$, so

$$\|\psi(y) - E(y)\| < \varepsilon\,.$$

As any G-averaging process on B preserves ideals, we have $\psi(y) \in \mathcal{J}$. Hence, we get $E(y) \in \overline{\mathcal{J}} = \mathcal{J}$. It clearly follows that $\mathcal{J}$ is E-invariant, as desired. □

4 Examples

This section is devoted to the discussion of some concrete examples.

4.1

As a warm-up, we consider the simple, but instructive case of an action of a group G on a nonempty finite (discrete) set X with n elements. Let α denote the associated action of G on $A = C(X) \simeq \mathbb{C}^n$ and $\sigma \in Z^2(G, \mathbb{T})$.

We may then pick $x_1, \ldots, x_m \in X$ such that X is the disjoint union of the orbits $O_j = \{g \cdot x_j \mid g \in G\}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, m$. Clearly, the O_j's are the minimal (closed) invariant subsets of X. Hence, if G is an exact

group in the class $\mathcal{P}$, we get from Corollary 3.12 that the simple quotients of $B = C_r^*\big(C(X), G, \alpha, \sigma\big)$ are given by

$$B_j = C_r^*\big(C(O_j), G, \alpha_j, \sigma\big)\,,\ j = 1, \ldots, m\,,$$

where α_j is the action on $C(O_j)$ obtained by restricting α for each j.

The assumption above that G is exact is in fact not necessary. Indeed, one easily sees that B is the direct sum of the B_j's. So if G belongs to $\mathcal{P}$, then Corollary 3.10 gives that all the B_j's are simple, and the same assertion as above follows readily.

Finally, assume that $\sigma = 1$. Then this characterization of the simple quotients of B still holds whenever G is a C*-simple group. Indeed, letting G_{x_j} denotes the isotropy group of x_j in G and identifying O_j with G/G_{x_j}, one gets from [8, Example 6.6] (see also [31, 22]) that each B_j is Morita equivalent to $C_r^*(G_{x_j})$. Now, if G is C*-simple, then each $C_r^*(G_{x_j})$ is simple (i.e. G_{x_j} is C*-simple) because G_{x_j} has finite index in G (cf. [16] and [27]), so the B_j's are the simple quotients of B.

4.2

Consider the canonical action lt of a group G by left translation on $\ell^\infty(G)$, in other words, the action associated with the natural left action of G on its Stone-Čech compactification βG [9, 20], and let $\sigma \in Z^2(G, \mathbb{T})$.

It is known that βG has $2^{2^{|G|}}$ minimal closed invariant subsets (see for instance [19, Theorem 1.4] and [20, Lemma 19.6]). Moreover, all these subsets are G-equivariantly homeomorphic to each other (this follows from [20, Theorem 19.8]). Hence, letting X_G denote one of these minimal closed invariant subsets, we get from Corollary 3.12 that if G is exact and belongs to $\mathcal{P}$, then the simple quotients of the "twisted" Roe algebra $C_r^*\big(\ell^\infty(G), G, \mathrm{lt}, \sigma\big)$ are all isomorphic to $C_r^*\big(C(X_G), G, \mathrm{lt}, \sigma\big)$.

In general, if G is exact and we assume that $\sigma = 1$, one may in fact deduce that there is a one-to-correspondence between the set of all invariant closed subsets of βG and the ideals of the Roe algebra $C_r^*(\ell^\infty(G), G, \mathrm{lt})$; indeed, since the action of G on βG is known to be free [9, Proposition 8.14], this follows from [32, Theorem 1.20].

4.3

Let $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}^3 \rtimes SL(3, \mathbb{Z})$ be the semidirect product of $\mathbb{Z}^3$ by the canonical action of $SL(3, \mathbb{Z})$. Since $\mathbb{Z}^3$ is a normal nontrivial amenable subgroup of

Γ, it is well known that Γ is not C*-simple. In aim to describe the maximal ideals of $C_r^*(\Gamma)$, we decompose

$$C_r^*(\Gamma) \simeq C_r^*\big(C_r^*(\mathbb{Z}^3), SL(3,\mathbb{Z}), \alpha\big) \simeq C_r^*\big(C(\mathbb{T}^3), SL(3,\mathbb{Z}), \tilde{\alpha}\big)$$

where α (resp. $\tilde{\alpha}$) denotes the associated action of $SL(3,\mathbb{Z})$ on $C_r^*(\mathbb{Z}^3)$ (resp. $C(\mathbb{T}^3)$). Now, $SL(3,\mathbb{Z})$ is exact [7] and belongs to $\mathcal{P}$ (since it has property $(P_{\rm com})$ [5]). Hence, appealing to Corollary 3.12, the maximal ideals of $C_r^*(\Gamma)$ are in a one-to-one correspondence with the minimal closed invariant subsets of $\mathbb{T}^3$. The orbits of the action of $SL(3,\mathbb{Z})$ on $\mathbb{T}^3$ are either finite or dense (see for instance [23, 14]), hence the minimal closed invariant subsets of $\mathbb{T}^3$ are the orbits of rational points in $\mathbb{T}^3 = \mathbb{R}^3/\mathbb{Z}^3$.

Let $x \in \mathbb{Q}^3/\mathbb{Z}^3 \subset \mathbb{T}^3$ and let G_x denote the isotropy group of x in $G = SL(3,\mathbb{Z})$. Then identifying the (finite) orbit O_x of x in $\mathbb{T}^3$ with G/G_x, we get that the simple quotient B_x of $C_r^*(\Gamma)$ corresponding to O_x is given by the reduced crossed product

$$B_x = C_r^*(C(O_x), G, \alpha^x) \simeq C_r^*(C(G/G_x), G, \beta^x)$$

where α^x is implemented by the action of G on O_x and β^x is implemented by the canonical left action of G on G/G_x. We note that B_x has a unique tracial state since G belongs to $\mathcal{P}$ and there is obviously only one invariant state on $C(O_x)$. Moreover, it follows from [8, Example 6.6] (see also [31, 22]) that B_x is Morita equivalent to $C_r^*(G_x)$. This implies that G_x is C*-simple, a fact that may also be deduced from [16] (see also [27]) since G_x has finite index in G.

4.4

Let Γ be an exact discrete group such that $G = \Gamma/Z$ belongs to the class $\mathcal{P}$, where $Z = Z(\Gamma)$ denotes the center of Γ. We can then easily deduce that the ideals of $C_r^*(\Gamma)$ are in a one-to-one correspondence with the open (resp. closed) subsets of the dual group $\widehat{Z}$. Indeed, using [1, Theorem 2.1], we can decompose

$$C_r^*(\Gamma) \simeq C_r^*\big(C_r^*(Z), G, \mathrm{id}, \omega\big) \simeq C_r^*\big(C(\widehat{Z}), G, \mathrm{id}, \widehat{\omega}\big)$$

where $\omega : G \times G \to \mathcal{U}\big(C_r^*(Z)\big)$ is given by

$$\omega(g,h) = \lambda_Z\big(n(g)n(h)n(gh)^{-1}\big) \quad (g,h \in G)$$

for some section $n : G \to \Gamma$ of the canonical homomorphism $q : \Gamma \to G$ such that $n(e_G) = e_\Gamma$, while the second isomorphism is implemented by Fourier

transform. So the assertion follows from Gelfand theory and Proposition 3.13.

Some specific examples are as follows:

- Consider $\Gamma = SL(2n, \mathbb{Z})$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $Z = Z(\Gamma) \simeq \mathbb{Z}_2$ and $G = \Gamma/Z = PSL(2n, \mathbb{Z})$ is exact (cf. [7, Section 5.4]) and belongs to $\mathcal{P}$ (cf. [5]). Hence, we get that $C_r^*\big(SL(2n, \mathbb{Z})\big)$ has two nontrivial ideals.

- Consider the pure braid group $\Gamma = P_n$ on n strands for some $n \geq 3$. Then $Z_n := Z(P_n) \simeq \mathbb{Z}$ and $G = P_n/Z_n$ is a weak Powers group (cf. [13] and [6]). Moreover P_n is exact; this follows by induction on n, using the exact sequence

$$1 \to \mathbb{F}_{n-1} \to P_n/Z_n \to P_{n-1}/Z_{n-1} \to 1$$

  (cf. [13, Proposition 6], where $P_2 = Z_2 = 2\mathbb{Z}$) and the fact that extension of exact groups are exact (cf. [7, Proposition 5.11]. Hence, we obtain that the ideals of $C_r^*(P_n)$ are in a one-to-one correspondence with the open (resp. closed) subsets of $\mathbb{T}$.

- Consider the braid group $\Gamma = B_3$ (i.e. the trefoil knot group). Then, $Z = Z(\Gamma) \simeq \mathbb{Z}$, and $G = \Gamma/Z \simeq \mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_3 \simeq PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ belongs to $\mathcal{P}$. As, by definition of P_3, we have an exact sequence $1 \to P_3 \to B_3 \to S_3 \to 1$, where S_3 denotes the symmetric group on three symbols, it follows that B_3 is exact. (This also follows from the fact that braid groups are known to be linear groups). Hence, we get that the ideals of $C_r^*(B_3)$ are in a one-to-one correspondence with the open (resp. closed) subsets of $\mathbb{T}$.

If one considers the braid group B_n on n strands for $n \geq 4$, then we believe that one should arrive at the same result as the one for B_3, but we don't know for the moment whether B_n/Z_n belongs to the class $\mathcal{P}$; B_n/Z_n is known to be a ultraweak Powers group [1, p. 536]), and Promislow has a result indicating that ultraweak Powers groups might be PH groups (see [30, Theorem 8.1]), but this is open in general.

5 Proof of Theorem 3.8

We start by representing $B = C_r^*(\Sigma)$ faithfully on a Hilbert space. Without loss of generality, we may assume that A acts faithfully on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, and let (π, λ) be any regular covariant representation of Σ on the Hilbert space $\ell^2(G, \mathcal{H})$; as in [1], we will work with the one defined by

$$\big(\pi(a)\xi\big)(h) = \alpha_{h^{-1}}(a)\,\xi(h),$$

$$\big(\lambda(g)\xi\,\big)(h) = \sigma(h^{-1}, g)\,\xi(g^{-1}h),$$

for $a \in A$, $\xi \in \ell^2(G, \mathcal{H})$, $h, g \in G$.

We may then identify B with $C^*\big(\pi(A), \lambda(G)\big)$. The canonical conditional expectation from B onto $\pi(A)$ will still be denoted by E. When $x \in B$, we set $\mathrm{supp}(x) = \{g \in G \mid \widehat{x}(g) \neq 0\}$, where $\widehat{x}(g) = E(x\,\lambda(g)^*)$. We will let B_0 denote the dense *-subalgebra of B generated by $\pi(A)$ and $\lambda(G)$. So if $x \in B_0$, we have

$$x \;=\; \sum_{g \in \mathrm{supp}(x)} \widehat{x}(g)\,\lambda(g) \quad \text{(finite sum)}\,.$$

If $D \subset G$, we let P_D denote the orthogonal projection from $\ell^2(G, \mathcal{H})$ to $\ell^2(D, \mathcal{H})$ (identified as a closed subspace of $\ell^2(G, \mathcal{H})$).

Moreover, if $F \in \ell^\infty\big(G, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\big)$, that is, $F : G \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is a map satisfying $\|F\|_\infty := \sup_{h \in G} \|F(h)\| < \infty$, we let $M_F \in \mathcal{B}\big(\ell^2(G, \mathcal{H})\big)$ be defined by

$$(M_F\,\xi)(h) = F(h)\,\xi(h)\,, \quad \xi \in \ell^2(G, \mathcal{H}),\, h \in G\,,$$

noting that $\|M_F\| = \|F\|_\infty < \infty$.

We remark that if $a \in A$ and we let $\pi_a : G \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be defined by $\pi_a(h) = \alpha_{h^{-1}}(a)$ for each $h \in H$, then $\pi_a \in \ell^\infty\big(G, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\big)$ and $M_{\pi_a} = \pi(a)$.

Straightforward computations give that for $F \in \ell^\infty\big(G, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\big)$, $D \subset G$ and $g \in G$, we have

$$M_F\,P_D = P_D\,M_F\,, \quad \lambda(g)\,P_D = P_{gD}\,\lambda(g)\,. \tag{3}$$

In passing, we remark that we also have $\lambda(g)\,M_F\,\lambda(g)^* = M_{F_g}$, where

$$F_g(h) = \sigma(h^{-1}, g)\,F(g^{-1}h)\,\sigma(h^{-1}, g)^*\,.$$

As a sample, we check that the second equation in (3) holds.

Let $\xi \in \ell^2(G, \mathcal{H})$ and $h \in G$. Then we have

$$[(\lambda(g)\, P_D)\xi](h) = \sigma(h^{-1}, g)(P_D\xi)(g^{-1}h) = \begin{cases} \sigma(h^{-1}, g)\, \xi(g^{-1}h) & \text{if } g^{-1}h \in D, \\ \\ 0 & \text{if } g^{-1}h \notin D \end{cases}$$

$$= \begin{cases} \sigma(h^{-1}, g)\, \xi(g^{-1}h) & \text{if } h \in gD, \\ \\ 0 & \text{if } h \notin gD \end{cases} = \begin{cases} (\lambda(g)\xi)(h) & \text{if } h \in gD, \\ \\ 0 & \text{if } h \notin gD \end{cases}$$

$= [(P_{gD}\, \lambda(g))\xi](h)$, as desired.

Let H be a subgroup of G. By a *simple H-averaging process* on B, we will mean a linear map $\phi : B \to B$ such that there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $h_1, \ldots, h_n \in H$ satisfying

$$\phi(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda(h_i)\, x\, \lambda(h_i)^* \quad \text{for all } \ x \in B.$$

Moreover, a *H-averaging process on B* is a linear map $\psi : B \to B$ such that there exist $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_m$ simple H-averaging processes on B with $\psi = \phi_m \circ \phi_{m-1} \circ \ldots \circ \phi_1$.

Let $\mathcal{U}_G$ denote the subgroup of $\mathcal{U}(B)$ generated by the $\lambda(g)$'s and let ψ be a G-averaging process on B. Clearly, for all $x \in B$, we then have

$$\psi(x) \in \mathrm{co}\big\{ v\, x\, v^* \,|\, v \in \mathcal{U}_G \big\}\,.$$

Hence, to show that Σ has (the strong) property (DP), it suffices to show that for every $x^* = x \in B$ satisfying $E(x) = 0$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a G-averaging process ψ on B such that $\|\psi(x)\| < \varepsilon$.

In fact, it suffices to show the last claim for every $x^* = x \in B_0$ satisfying $E(x) = 0$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$. Indeed, assume that this holds and consider some $b^* = b \in B$ satisfying $E(b) = 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Then pick $y^* = y \in B_0$ such that $\|b - y\| \leq \varepsilon/3$, and set $x = y - E(y)$. Then $x^* = x \in B_0$ and $E(x) = 0$, so we can find a G-averaging process on B such that $\|\psi(x)\| < \varepsilon/3$. Since $\|E(y)\| = \|E(y - b)\| \leq \|y - b\| < \varepsilon/3$, we get

$$\|\psi(b)\| \leq \|\psi(b - y)\| + \|\psi(y - E(y))\| + \|\psi(E(y))\|$$

$$\leq \|b - y\| + \|\psi(x)\| + \|E(y)\| < \varepsilon\,,$$

as desired.

5.1

In this subsection we will prove that Theorem 3.8 holds when G is a PH group, as defined in [30]. We first recall the definition of a PH group.

If $g \in G$ and $A \subset G$, then set

$$< g >_A = \{aga^{-1} \mid a \in A\}\,.$$

Now, if $T \subset G$ and $\emptyset \neq M \subset G \setminus \{e\}$, then T is said to be *M-large* (in G) if

$$m(G \setminus T) \subset T \quad \text{for all } m \in M\,.$$

Further, let $\emptyset \neq F \subset G \setminus \{e\}$ and $H \subset G$. Then H is said to be a *Powers set for F* if, for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist $h_1, \ldots, h_N \in H$ and pairwise disjoint subsets $T_1, \ldots, T_N$ of G such that T_j is $h_j F h_j^{-1}$-large for $j = 1, \ldots, N$. Moreover, if $g \in G \setminus \{e\}$, then H is said to be a *c-Powers set for g* if H is a Powers set for $< g >_M$ for all finite, non-empty subsets M of H.

If G is a weak Powers group (see [6, 1, 16]), then G is a c-Powers set for any $g \in G \setminus \{e\}$. More generally, G is said to be a *PH group* if, given any finite non-empty subset F of $G \setminus \{e\}$, one can write $F = \{f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_n\}$ and find a chain of subgroups $G_1 \subset G_2 \subset \cdots \subset G_n \subset G$ such that G_j is a c-Powers set for f_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$.

Note that in his definition of a PH group, Promislow just requires that one can find a chain of subsets $e \in G_1 \subset G_2 \subset \cdots \subset G_n$ of G such that G_j is a c-Powers set for f_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$. Requiring these subsets to be subgroups of G (or at least subsemigroups) seems necessary to us for the proof of his main result, [30, Theorem 5.3], to go through. We will use the subsemigroup property in the proof of Lemma 5.3.

The class of PH groups has the interesting property that it closed under extensions [30, Theorem 4.6][2]. For example, an extension of a weak Powers group by a weak Powers group is a PH group (but not necessarily a weak Powers group).

We will need a lemma of de la Harpe and Skandalis ([17, Lemma 1]; see also [1, Lemma 4.3]) in a slightly generalized form. For completeness, we include the proof, which is close to the one given in [17].

[2]One easily checks that all the results in [30] are still true under our slightly more restrictive definition.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a Hilbert space and $x^* = x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Assume that there exist orthogonal projections p_1, p_2, p_3 and unitary operators u_1, u_2, u_3 on $\mathcal{H}$ such that*

$$p_1\, x\, p_1 = p_2\, x\, p_2 = p_3\, x\, p_3 = 0$$

and $u_1(1-p_1)u_1^*$, $u_2(1-p_2)u_2^*$, $u_3(1-p_3)u_3^*$ are pairwise orthogonal. Then we have

$$\Big\| \frac{1}{3} \sum_{j=1}^{3} u_j\, x\, u_j^* \Big\| \;\leq\; \Big(\frac{5}{6} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{9} \Big)\, \|x\| < 0.991\, \|x\|$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may clearly assume that $\|x\| = 1$.

Set $y = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{j=1}^{3} u_j\, x\, u_j^*$ and $q_j = u_j\, (1-p_j)\, u_j^*$, $j = 1, 2, 3$.

Let $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$, $\|\xi\| = 1$. Since the q_j's are pairwise orthogonal, there exists an index j such that $\|q_j\, \xi\|^2 \leq 1/3$. We may assume that $j = 1$, and set $\xi_1 = u_1^*\, \xi$.

As $\|(1-p_1)\, \xi_1\|^2 = \|q_1\, \xi\|^2 \leq 1/3$, one has

$$\|p_1 \xi_1\|^2 \geq 2/3 \quad \text{and} \quad \|p_1\, x\, (1-p_1)\, \xi_1\|^2 \leq 1/3\,.$$

Now, since $p_1\, x\, p_1 = 0$ by assumption, we get

$$\|x\, \xi_1 - \xi_1\| \geq \|p_1\, \xi_1 - p_1\, x\, \xi_1\| = \|p_1\, \xi_1 - p_1\, x\, (1-p_1) \xi_1 - p_1\, x\, p_1 \xi_1\|$$

$$\geq \big|\, \|p_1\, \xi_1\| - \|p_1\, x\, (1-p_1) \xi_1\| \,\big| \geq \frac{\sqrt{2}-1}{\sqrt{3}}$$

As $\|x\, \xi_1 - \xi_1\|^2 \;\leq\; 2\, \big(1 - \langle x\, \xi_1, \xi_1 \rangle\big)$, it follows that

$$\big\langle x\, \xi_1, \xi_1 \big\rangle \;\leq\; 1 - \frac{1}{2} \|x\, \xi_1 - \xi_1\|^2 \leq 1 - \frac{1}{2} \Big(\frac{\sqrt{2}-1}{\sqrt{3}} \Big)^2 = \frac{3 + 2\sqrt{2}}{6}$$

So, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get

$$\big\langle y\, \xi, \xi \big\rangle \;\leq\; \frac{1}{3} \big\langle x\, \xi_1, \xi_1 \big\rangle + \frac{2}{3} \;\leq\; \frac{1}{3} \Big(\frac{3 + 2\sqrt{2}}{6} + 2 \Big) = \frac{5}{6} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{9} < 0.991\,.$$

The same argument with $-x$ gives

$$\Big| \big\langle y\, \xi, \xi \big\rangle \Big| \;\leq\; \frac{5}{6} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{9} < 0.991\,.$$

Since y is self-adjoint, taking the supremum over all $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $\|\xi\| = 1$, we obtain

$$\|y\| \leq\; \frac{5}{6} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{9} < 0.991\,,$$

as desired. □

Lemma 5.2. *Let $x^* = x \in B_0$ satisfy $E(x) = 0$ and set $S = \mathrm{supp}(x)$. Assume that $S \subset F \cup F^{-1}$ for some finite subset F of $G \setminus \{e\}$ and that there exists a subgroup H of G which is a Powers set for F.*

Then there exists an H-simple averaging process ϕ on B such that

$$\|\phi(x)\| < 0.991\,\|x\|\,.$$

Proof. One easily sees that H is also a Powers set for $S = F \cup F^{-1}$ (cf. [30, Lemma 2.1]). Pick $h_1, h_2, h_3 \in H$ and pairwise disjoint subsets T_1, T_2, T_3 of G such that T_j is $h_j S h_j^{-1}$-large for $j = 1, 2, 3$.

For each j, set $E_j = h_j^{-1} T_j$, $\;D_j = G \setminus E_j$ and let p_j be the orthogonal projection from $\ell^2(G, \mathcal{H})$ onto $\ell^2(D_j, \mathcal{H})$. Then we have $p_j\, x\, p_j = 0$ for each j. Indeed, one easily checks that T_j is $h_j S h_j^{-1}$-large means that

$$s\, D_j \cap D_j = \emptyset \quad \text{for every } \; s \in S\,.$$

Hence, using the identities in (3), the above assertion readily follows.

Moreover, set $q_j = \lambda(h_j)\,(1 - p_j)\lambda(h_j)^*$. Then q_j is the orthogonal projection from $\ell^2(G, \mathcal{H})$ onto $\ell^2(h_j E_j, \mathcal{H}) = \ell^2(T_j, \mathcal{H})$. Since the T_j's are pairwise disjoint, the q_j's are pairwise orthogonal. Thus, we can apply Lemma 5.1 and conclude that

$$\Big\| \frac{1}{3} \sum_{j=1}^{3} \lambda(h_j)\, x\, \lambda(h_j)^* \Big\| \;<\; 0.991\,\|x\|$$

which shows the assertion.

□

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\delta > 0$, $g \in G \setminus \{e\}$ and assume that there exists a subgroup H of G which is a c-Powers set for g. Let $x^* = x \in B_0$ satisfy*

$$\mathrm{supp}(x) \;= <g>_M \cup <g^{-1}>_M$$

for some finite non-empty subset M of H.

Then there exists an H-averaging process ψ on B such that $\|\psi(x)\| < \delta$.

Proof. By assumption, H is a Powers set for $<g>_M$. Applying Lemma 5.2 (with $F = <g>_M$), we get that there exists an H-simple averaging process ϕ_1 on B such that $\|\phi_1(x)\| < d\,\|x\|$, where $d = 0.991$. Now, one easily checks (cf. [1, Lemma 4.4]) that

$$\mathrm{supp}\big(\phi_1(x)\big) \;\subset\; <g>_{M_1} \,\cup\, <g^{-1}>_{M_1}\,,$$

where M_1 is a finite non-empty subset of H (since H is closed under multiplication, being a subgroup). Moreover, $\phi_1(x)$ is a selfadjoint element of B_0 satisfying $E(\phi_1(x)) = 0$. Hence we can apply Lemma 5.2 (with $F =< g >_{M_1}$) and get that there exists an H-simple averaging process ϕ_2 on B such that

$$\|\phi_2(\phi_1(x))\| \,<\, d\,\|\phi_1(x)\| \,\leq\, d^2\,\|x\|\,.$$

Iterating this process, we get that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist H-simple averaging processes $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_k$ on B such that

$$\|(\phi_k \circ \cdots \phi_1)(x))\| \,<\, d^k\,\|x\|\,.$$

Choosing k such that $d^k < \delta$ gives the result.

□

Theorem 5.4. *Assume G is a PH group. Then Σ has property (DP).*

Proof. Let $x^* = x \in B_0$ satisfy $E(x) = 0$, and let $\varepsilon > 0$. Write $S = \mathrm{supp}(x)$ as a disjoint union $S = E \cup F \cup F^{-1}$ where $E = \{s \in S \mid s^2 = e\}$.

Consider $E \cup F \subset G \setminus \{e\}$. Since G is a PH group, we can write $E \cup F = \{s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n\}$ and find a chain of subgroups $G_1 \subset G_2 \subset \cdots \subset G_n \subset G$ such that G_j is a c-Powers set for s_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$. Thus, each G_j is a Powers set for $< s_j >_M$, for all finite subsets M of G_j.

Write $x = \sum_{j=1}^n x_j$, where $x_j^* = x_j \in B_0$ and $\mathrm{supp}(x_j) = \{s_j\} \cup \{s_j^{-1}\}$ for each j. (Note that if $s_j \in E$, we have $s_j^{-1} = s_j$, so $\mathrm{supp}(x_j) = \{s_j\}$).

Since $\mathrm{supp}(x_1) =< s_1 >_M \cup < s_1^{-1} >_M$, with $M = \{e\} \subset G_1$, and G_1 is a c-Powers set for s_1, Lemma 5.3 applies and gives that there exists a G_1-averaging process ψ_1 on B such that $\|\psi_1(x_1)\| < \varepsilon/n$.

Now, consider $\tilde{x}_2 = \psi_1(x_2)$. Then $\mathrm{supp}(\tilde{x}_2) =< s_2 >_M \cup < s_2^{-1} >_M$ for some finite subset M of G_1. Since G_1 is contained in G_2, and G_2 is a c-Powers set for s_2, Lemma 5.3 applies again and gives that there exists a G_2-averaging process ψ_2 on B such that $\|\psi_2(\tilde{x}_2)\| < \varepsilon/n$, that is, $\|(\psi_2 \circ \psi_1)(x_2)\| < \varepsilon/n$.

Proceeding inductively, let $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ and assume that for each $j = 1, \ldots, k$, we have constructed a G_j-averaging process ψ_j on B, such that $\|(\psi_j \circ \cdots \circ \psi_1)(x_j)\| < \varepsilon/n$ for $j = 1, \ldots, k$. Then consider $\tilde{x}_{k+1} = (\psi_k \circ \cdots \circ \psi_1)(x_{k+1})$. Then $\mathrm{supp}(\tilde{x}_{k+1}) =< s_{k+1} >_M \cup < s_{k+1}^{-1} >_M$ for some finite subset M of G_k. Since G_k is contained in G_{k+1}, and G_{k+1} is a c-Powers set for s_{k+1}, Lemma 5.3 applies and gives that there exists a G_{k+1}-averaging process ψ_{k+1} on B such that $\|\psi_{k+1}(\tilde{x}_{k+1})\| < \varepsilon/n$, that is, $\|(\psi_{k+1} \circ \cdots \circ \psi_1)(x_{k+1})\| < \varepsilon/n$.

Repeating this until $k = n-1$, we obtain, for each $1 \leq j \leq n$, a G_j-averaging process ψ_j on B such that $\|(\psi_j \circ \cdots \circ \psi_1)(x_j)\| < \varepsilon/n$. Set $\psi = \psi_n \circ \cdots \circ \psi_1$. Then ψ is a G-averaging process on B and, for each $1 \leq j \leq n$, we have

$$\|\psi(x_j)\| = \|(\psi_n \circ \cdots \circ \psi_{j+1} \circ \psi_j \circ \cdots \circ \psi_1)(x_j)\| \leq \|(\psi_j \circ \cdots \circ \psi_1)(x_j)\| < \varepsilon/n\,,$$

so we get

$$\|\psi(x)\| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n} \|\psi(x_j)\| < \varepsilon\,.$$

This shows that Σ satisfies (the strong) property DP.

□

5.2

We now turn to the proof that Σ has property (DP) when G satisfies property $(P_{\rm com})$. We will adapt the arguments given in [5] to cover the twisted case. We recall from [5] that *G is said to have property* $(P_{\rm com})$ when the following holds:

Given any non-empty finite subset $F \subset G \setminus \{e\}$, there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $g_0 \in G$ and subsets U, D_1, …, D_n of G such that

(i) $G \setminus U \subset D_1 \cup \cdots \cup D_n$,

(ii) $g\,U \cap U = \emptyset$ for all $g \in F$,

(iii) $g_0^{-j} D_k \cap D_k = \emptyset$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k = 1, \ldots, n$.

Lemma 5.5. *(cf. [5]). Let $g \in G \setminus \{e\}$ and assume there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and subsets U, D_1, …, D_n of G such that*

$$G \setminus U \subset D_1 \cup \cdots \cup D_n \quad \text{and} \quad g\,U \cap U = \emptyset\,.$$

Let $F \in \ell^\infty\big(G, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\big)$ and $\xi, \eta \in \ell^2(G, \mathcal{H})$. Then we have

$$|\,\big\langle\, M_F \lambda(g)\xi\,,\,\eta\,\big\rangle\,| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n} \Big(\|M_F \lambda(g)\xi\|\,\|P_{D_j}\eta\| + \|P_{D_j}\xi\|\,\|M_F^*\eta\| \Big) \qquad (4)$$

Proof. We set $V = G \setminus U$, and note that $P_U\,P_{g\,U} = P_{U \cap g\,U} = 0$. Thus, making use of (3), we get

$$\big\langle\, M_F \lambda(g)\xi\,,\,\eta\,\big\rangle = \big\langle\, M_F \lambda(g) P_U\,\xi\,,\,\eta\,\big\rangle + \big\langle\, M_F \lambda(g) P_V\,\xi\,,\,\eta\,\big\rangle$$

$$= \big\langle P_{gU} M_F \lambda(g)\,\xi\,,\,(P_U + P_V)\,\eta\,\big\rangle + \big\langle\,\lambda(g) P_V\,\xi\,,\,M_F^*\,\eta\,\big\rangle$$
$$= \big\langle P_{gU} M_F \lambda(g)\,\xi\,,\,P_V\,\eta\,\big\rangle + \big\langle\,\lambda(g) P_V\,\xi\,,\,M_F^*\eta\,\big\rangle\,.$$

Thus, the triangle inequality and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality give

$$\begin{aligned}|\,\big\langle\,M_F\lambda(g)\,\xi\,,\,\eta\,\big\rangle\,| \;&\leq\; |\,\big\langle\,P_{gU}M_F\lambda(g)\,\xi\,,\,P_V\,\eta\,\big\rangle\,| \;+\; |\,\big\langle\,\lambda(g)P_V\,\xi\,,\,M_F^*\eta\,\big\rangle\,|\\ &\leq \|M_F\lambda(g)\,\xi\|\,\|P_V\,\eta\| + \|P_V\,\xi\|\,\|M_F^*\eta\|\\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{n}\Big(\|M_F\lambda(g)\,\xi\|\,\|P_{D_j}\eta\| + \|P_{D_j}\xi\|\,\|M_F^*\eta\|\Big)\end{aligned}$$

since $\|P_V\zeta\| \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \|P_{D_j}\zeta\|$ for any $\zeta \in \ell^2(G,\mathcal{H})$, as is easily checked, using that $V \subset D_1 \cup \cdots \cup D_n$.

□

Lemma 5.6. *Let $D \subset G$, $\zeta \in \ell^2(G,\mathcal{H})$ and assume there exist $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $g_1,\ldots,g_N \in G$ such that g_1D, …, g_ND are pairwise disjoint. Then we have*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} \|P_{g_jD}\,\zeta\| \;\leq\; \sqrt{N}\,\|\zeta\|\,.$$

Proof. The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the assumption give

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} \|P_{g_jD}\,\zeta\| \;\leq\; \sqrt{N}\Big[\sum_{j=1}^{N}\|P_{g_jD}\,\zeta\|^2\Big]^{1/2} \;=\; \sqrt{N}\Big[\sum_{h\,\in\,g_1D\cup\cdots\cup g_ND}\|\zeta(h)\|^2\Big]^{1/2}$$
$$\leq\; \sqrt{N}\,\|\eta\|\,.$$

□

Lemma 5.7. *Assume that G has property (P_{com}).*
Let F be a finite non-empty subset of $G\setminus\{e\}$, $a_g \in A$ for each $g \in F$, and set $y_0 = \sum_{g\,\in\,F}\,\pi(a_g)\,\lambda(g) \in B$. Then we have

$$0 \;\in\; \overline{co\{v\,y_0\,v^*\,|\,v\in\mathcal{U}_G\}}^{\,\|\cdot\|}\,.$$

Proof. Since G has property (P_{com}), we may pick $n\in\mathbb{N}$, $g_0\in G$ and subsets U, D_1, …, D_n of G so that $(i),(ii)$ and (iii) in the definition of property (P_{com}) hold with respect to the given F.

For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we set $g_j = g_0^{-j}$. Moreover, for each $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we set

$$y_N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda(g_j)\, y_0\, \lambda(g_j)^* \;\in\; \mathrm{co}\{v\, y_0\, v^* \,|\, v \in \mathcal{U}_G\}\,.$$

We will show that

$$\|y_N\| \;\leq\; \frac{2\,n}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{g \in F} \|a_g\| \tag{5}$$

Thus, we will get that $\|y_N\| \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$, from which the assertion to be proven will clearly follow.

To prove (5), fix $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Since

$$y_N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{g \in F} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda(g_j)\, \pi(a_g)\, \lambda(g)\, \lambda(g_j)^*\,,$$

we have

$$\|y_N\| \;\leq\; \frac{1}{N} \sum_{g \in F} \|z_g\|\,, \tag{6}$$

where $z_g = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda(g_j)\, \pi(a_g)\, \lambda(g)\, \lambda(g_j)^*$ for each $g \in F$.

Let $g \in F$ and $\xi,\, \eta \in \ell^2(G, \mathcal{H})$. As condition (iii) implies that for each $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, the sets $g_1 D_k$, …, $g_N D_k$ are pairwise disjoint, Lemma 5.6 gives that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} \|P_{g_j D_k}\, \eta\| \;\leq\; \sqrt{N}\, \|\eta\| \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{N} \|P_{g_j D_k}\, \xi\| \;\leq\; \sqrt{N}\, \|\xi\| \tag{7}$$

Now, using Lemma 5.5 N-times (with $M_F = \pi(a_g)$) at the second step, we get

$$|\langle z_g\, \xi\,,\, \eta\rangle| \;\leq \sum_{j=1}^{N} \big|\big\langle\, \pi(a_g) \lambda(g)\, \lambda(g_j)^*\, \xi\,,\, \lambda(g_j)^*\, \eta\big\rangle\big|$$

$$\leq \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \Big(\|\pi(a_g) \lambda(g)\, \lambda(g_j)^*\, \xi\|\, \|P_{D_k} \lambda(g_j)^*\, \eta\| + \|P_{D_k} \lambda(g_j)^*\, \xi\|\, \|\pi(a_g)^*\, \lambda(g_j)^*\, \eta\| \Big)$$

$$\leq \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \Big(\|\pi(a_g)\|\, \|\xi\|\, \|P_{g_j D_k}\, \eta\| + \|P_{g_j D_k}\, \xi\|\, \|\pi(a_g)\|\, \|\eta\| \Big)$$

$$= \|a_g\| \sum_{k=1}^{n} \Big(\|\xi\| \, (\sum_{j=1}^{N} \|P_{g_j D_k} \, \eta\|) \; + \; \|\eta\| \, (\sum_{j=1}^{N} \|P_{g_j D_k} \, \xi\|) \Big)$$

$$\leq \; \|a_g\| \, 2 \, n \, \sqrt{N} \, \|\xi\| \, \|\eta\| \, ,$$

where we have used (7) to get the final inequality.

This implies that

$$\|z_g\| \; \leq \; 2 \, n \, \sqrt{N} \, \|a_g\| \, .$$

Using (6), we therefore get

$$\|y_N\| \; \leq \; \frac{1}{N} \, 2 \, n \, \sqrt{N} \sum_{g \in F} \|a_g\| = \frac{2 \, n}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{g \in F} \|a_g\| \, ,$$

that is, the inequality (5) holds, as desired.

□

Theorem 5.8. *Assume that G has property $(P_{\rm com})$. Then Σ has property (DP).*

Proof. Lemma 5.7 shows that if $x \in B_0$ satisfies $E(x) = 0$, and $\varepsilon > 0$, then there exists a G-averaging process on B such that $\|\psi(x)\| < \varepsilon$. Hence, it follows that Σ has (the strong) property (DP).

□

Note that the proof of Theorem 5.8 in fact implies that when G has property $(P_{\rm com})$, then Σ satisfies that

$$0 \; \in \; \overline{\mathrm{co}\{v \, y \, v^* \mid v \in \mathcal{U}_G\}}^{\, \|\cdot\|} \tag{8}$$

for every $y \in B$ satisfying $E(y) = 0$. As mentioned in Remark 3.2, this is true whenever Σ satisfies the strong form of property (DP) (hence also when G is a PH group):

Proposition 5.9. *Assume that Σ satisfies the strong form of property (DP). Then (8) holds for every $y \in B$ satisfying $E(y) = 0$.*

Proof. Let $y \in B$ satisfy $E(y) = 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Write $y = x_1 + i \, x_2$, where $x_1 = \mathrm{Re}(y)$, $x_2 = \mathrm{Im}(y)$. Note that $E(x_1) = \frac{1}{2} \, (E(y) + E(y)^*) = 0$, and, similarly, $E(x_2) = 0$. Using the assumption, we can find a G-averaging process ψ_1 on B such that $\|\psi_1(x_1)\| < \varepsilon/2$. Now, set $\tilde{x}_2 = \psi_1(x_2)$. Then $\tilde{x}_2$ is self-adjoint, and, using the equivariance property of E, one deduces that

$E(\tilde{x}_2) = E(x_2) = 0$. Hence, we can find a G-averaging process ψ_2 on B such that $\|\psi_2(\tilde{x}_2)\| < \varepsilon/2$. Set $\psi = \psi_2 \circ \psi_1$. Then we get

$$\|\psi(y)\| \leq \|\psi(x_1)\| + \|\psi(x_2)\| \leq \|\psi_1(x_1)\| + \|\psi_2(\tilde{x}_2)\| < \varepsilon\,,$$

and it follows that (8) holds.

□

References

[1] E. Bédos: Discrete groups and simple C^*-algebras. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **109** (1991), 521–537.

[2] E. Bédos: On the uniqueness of the trace on some simple C*-algebras. *J.Operator Th.* **30** (1993), 149–160.

[3] E. Bédos, R. Conti: On discrete twisted C*-dynamical systems, Hilbert C*-modules and regularity. *Münster J. Math.* **5**(2012), 183–208.

[4] E. Bédos, R. Conti: Fourier series and twisted C^*-crossed products. Preprint (2013), arXiv:1303.7381.

[5] M.E. Bekka, M. Cowling, P. de la Harpe: *Some groups whose reduced C^*-algebra is simple*. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. No. **80** (1994), 117–134.

[6] F. Boca, V. Nitica: Combinatorial properties of groups and simple C*-algebras with a unique trace. *J. Operator Th.* **20** (1988), 183–196.

[7] N.P. Brown, N. Ozawa: *C^*-algebras and finite-dimensional approximations*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, Vol. 88, Amer. Math. Soc. Providence, RI, 2008.

[8] S. Echterhoff: Crossed products, the Mackey-Rieffel-Green machine and applications. Preprint (2010), *arXiv:1006.4975*.

[9] R. Ellis: *Lectures on topological dynamics*. W.A. Benjamin, Inc. New York, 1969.

[10] R. Exel: Amenability for Fell bundles. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **492** (1997), 41–73.

[11] R. Exel: Exact groups and Fell bundles. *Math. Ann.* **323** (2002), 259–266.

[12] R. Exel: Exact groups, induced ideals and Fell bundles. Preprint version of [11](2000); available at arXiv:math/0012091v1.

[13] T. Giordano, P. de la Harpe: Groupes de tresses et moyennabilité intérieure. *Arkiv för Mat.* **29** (1991), 63–72.

[14] Y. Guivarc'h and A. N. Starkov: Orbits of linear group actions, random walks on homogeneous spaces and toral automorphisms. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* 24 (2004), 767–802.

[15] U. Haagerup, L. Zsido: Sur la propriété de Dixmier pour les C*-algèbres. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* **298** (1984), 173–177.

[16] P. de la Harpe: On simplicity of reduced group C*-algebras. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* **39** (2007), 1–26.

[17] P. de la Harpe, G. Skandalis: Powers' property and simple C*-algebras. *Math. Ann.* **273** (1986), 241–250.

[18] P. de la Harpe, J.-P. Préaux: C*-simple groups: amalgamated free products, HNN-extensions, and fundamental groups of 3-manifolds. *J. Topol. Anal.* **3** (2011), 451–489.

[19] N. Hindman, L. Legette, D. Strauss: The number of minimal left and minimal right ideals in βS. *Topology Proc.* **39** (2012), 45–68.

[20] N. Hindman, D. Strauss: Algebra in the Stone-Cech compactification – Theory and applications (2nd revised and extended ed.). De Gruyter, Berlin/Boston, 2012.

[21] N.A. Ivanov: On the structure of some reduced amalgamated free product C*-algebras. *Internat. J. of Math.* **22** (2011), 281–306.

[22] E. Kirchberg, S. Wassermann: Permanence properties of C*-exact groups. *Doc. Math. J.*4 (1999), 513–558.

[23] R. Muchnik: Semigroup actions on $\mathbb{T}^n$. *Geom. Dedicata* **110** (2005), 1–47.

[24] A.Yu. Olshanskii, D.V. Osin: C^*-simple groups without free subgroups. Preprint (2014), arXiv:1401.7300.

[25] J.A. Packer, I. Raeburn: Twisted crossed products of C^*-algebras. *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **106** (1989), 293–311.

[26] J. Peterson, A. Thom: Group cocycles and the ring of affiliated operators. *Invent. Math.* **185** (2011), 561–592.

[27] S. Popa: On the relative Dixmier property for inclusions of C^*-algebras. *J. Funct. Anal.* **171** (2000), 139–154.

[28] R.T. Powers: Simplicity of the C*-algebra associated with the free group on two generators. *Duke Math. J.* **42** (1975), 151–156.

[29] T. Poznansky: Characterization of linear groups whose reduced C*-algebras are simple. Preprint (2008), arXiv:0812.2486.

[30] S.D. Promislow: A class of groups producing simple, unique trace C*-algebras. *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **114** (1993), 223–233.

[31] J.C. Quigg, J. Spielberg: Regularity and hyporegularity in C^*-dynamical systems. *Houston J. Math.* **18** (1992), 139-152.

[32] A. Sierakowski: The ideal structure of reduced crossed products. *Münster J. Math.* **3** (2010), 237–262.

[33] R.D. Tucker-Drob: Shift-minimal groups, fixed price 1, and the unique trace property. Preprint (2012), arXiv:1211.6395.

[34] D.P. Williams: *Crossed products of C^*-algebras*. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, Vol. 134, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007.

[35] G. Zeller-Meier: Produits croisés d'une C^*-algèbre par un groupe d'automorphismes. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **47** (1968), 101–239.

Addresses of the authors:

Erik Bédos, Institute of Mathematics, University of Oslo,
P.B. 1053 Blindern, N-0316 Oslo, Norway.
E-mail: bedos@math.uio.no.

Roberto Conti, Dipartimento di Scienze di Base e Applicate per l'Ingegneria,
Sezione di Matematica, Sapienza Università di Roma
Via A. Scarpa 16, I-00161 Roma, Italy.
E-mail: roberto.conti@sbai.uniroma1.it